

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

The Abstract of the Disclosure has been objected to as not being in compliance with M.P.E.P. §608.01(b); Claim 1 has been objected to as containing informalities; Claims 1-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mossi et al. in view of David et al. and Claims 5-9 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 5 has now been canceled, without prejudice, and thus, Claims 1-4 and 6-9 remain active.

Considering first then the Examiner's objection to the Abstract, it is to be noted that such has now been amended so as to contain not more than 150 words as suggested by the Examiner.

Considering next then the Examiner's objection to Claim 1, it is to be noted that each of the informalities mentioned by the Examiner have now been appropriately corrected. Since these corrections are based upon the language suggested by the Examiner, it is submitted that Claim 1 fully complies with U.S. patent practice and procedure.

Considering next then the rejection of Claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mossi et al. in view of David et al., it is to be noted that language based upon limitations contained in Claims 4 and 5 have now been added to Claim 1. In view of this and in view of the fact that the language of Claim 5 was only objected to as and was indicated as containing allowable subject matter, it is submitted that Claim 1 as now amended merits indication of allowability. It is noted in this regard that revisions have been made to the claim language added to Claim 1 so as to not include all of the limitations set forth in Claims 4 and 5 but Claim 1 is believed to include those limitations from Claims 4 and 5 not

found in the prior art. Each of Claims 2-4 and 6-9 depend either directly or indirectly upon Claim 1. It is therefore submitted that such dependent claims also merit indication of allowability.


In view of the foregoing, an early and favorable Office Action is believed to be in order and the same is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599



James D. Hamilton
Registration No. 28,421

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)
JDH/rac

I:\ATTY\JDH\285\285724US\285724US AM DUE 04.10.08.DOC